

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MATTIE ASHANTI ZUNAE
WILLIAMS, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIE WILLIAMS,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

June 7, 2007

No. 275968

Saginaw Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 03-028849-NA

Before: Davis, P.J., and Hoekstra and Donofrio, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court order that terminated his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (l). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

On appeal, respondent challenges only the trial court's determination regarding the minor child's best interests. A trial court is required to terminate a parent's rights if clear and convincing evidence establishes at least one statutory basis for termination, unless termination is clearly against the child's best interests.¹ In this case, the trial court reviewed the whole record and found so much evidence to support the termination order that further proceedings were unwarranted. As noted by the court, the minor child had been in care for about 15 months of her young life by the time of the termination proceeding, and she was in need of a stable home environment. Although her interaction with respondent during visitations was good and included appropriate affection, there was no evidence of a strong bond shared between the two. Respondent's claim that he could provide proper care or custody for the child was not supported by his actions during the proceeding where he did not attend even half of the visitations available to him in 2006. Respondent's own admissions of using marijuana contradicted his testimony that he did not use illegal substances. His testimony was also unbelievable in light of the fact

¹ MCL 712A.19b(5); MCR 3.977(E), (F)(1), and (G)(3); *In re Gazella*, 264 Mich App 668, 678; 692 NW2d 708 (2005).

that two separate testing companies found that respondent's drug tests returned positive results for marijuana and cocaine. Further, respondent's claims regarding benzodiazepines and an alleged pain pill were also implausible. His ongoing refusal to acknowledge dangerous behavior would place the child at risk of harm should she be returned to respondent's care. Given this significant amount of evidence, the trial court did not clearly err in its best interest determination.²

Affirmed.

/s/ Alton T. Davis
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Pat M. Donofrio

² MCR 3.977(J).